



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,932	03/30/2004	Peter E. Hart	20412-08383	7930
76137	7590	01/15/2009	EXAMINER	
RICOH/FENWICK			THOMPSON, JAMES A	
SILICON VALLEY CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET			2625	
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/15/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM
gsueoka@fenwick.com
nmorad@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/814,932	Applicant(s) HART ET AL.
	Examiner James A. Thompson	Art Unit 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 and 25 November 2008 and 05 January 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4-27,29,31-41,43-49 and 56-68 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/25/08, 1/5/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 20 November 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding page 12, lines 1-9: Applicant's present amendments to the claims and arguments have been fully considered and are addressed in the proceeding remarks and prior art rejections.

Regarding page 12, line 10 to page 14, line 5: In Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), a client apparatus (figure 1(1) of Yoshimura) transmits a command which is relayed by the camera server to the appropriate camera. The camera correspondingly captures the time-based media and transmits the time-based media back to the requesting client (see column 6, lines 39-51 of Yoshimura). Thus, Yoshimura does teach issuing a command that controls the media source to transmit the time-based media data back to the issuing device. By combination with Sugiyama (US-5,633,723) and Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), the command issuing device would be the multimedia processing system.

Regarding page 14, line 6 to page 15, line 17: While Yoshimura is not strictly related to the printing arts, this does not disqualify Yoshimura from being analogous art. Further, the fact that Yoshimura is classed in the USPTO classification system differently than Sugiyama and Ishikawa also does not disqualify Yoshimura from being analogous art. The particular classification system used by the USPTO is not the only way of determining which references are analogous art. Analogous art is art which is either in the same field of endeavor or in the same problem solving area. In the case of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura, all three are analogous art since all three are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of multimedia data. Also, Yoshimura has not been relied upon for anything with respect to printing, but rather with respect to how commands are transmitted and carried out, and the resultant data received. Further, while Yoshimura is not strictly within the printing

arts, there are many aspects of Sugiyama and Ishikawa, as well as many aspects of the claimed invention, which are not strictly related to printing either. So, it is not necessary for a reference to be within the printing arts in order for that reference to be considered analogous art with respect to Sugiyama and the presently claimed invention.

Yoshimura would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art how to handle commands between the client device and the external time-based media capturing device. In Sugiyama, there is an interface which connected the time-based media printer/display device to a time-based media data source. The details of the time-based media data source are beyond the scope of what is considered the key behind the invention disclosed in Sugiyama. However, if one of ordinary skill in the art were presented with Yoshimura, one of ordinary skill in the art would then have disclosed details of how a client device, such as the multimedia processing system of Sugiyama, can communicate with the time-based media data source. “A person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton” (*KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742). Simply applying the already disclosed communication setup taught by Yoshimura to the system taught by Sugiyama would be within the ability of one of “ordinary creativity” and such a combination would produce predictable results based on the digital data communication taught by Yoshimura.

Regarding page 15, line 18 to page 27, line 8: Applicant’s arguments with respect to independent claim 41 and the dependent claims are based on the assumption that the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura do not fully teach the limitations in claim 1 previously argued by Applicant. Thus, Applicant’s arguments with respect to independent claim 41 and the dependent claims are fully addressed above. The present amendments to the claims have been fully considered by Examiner and are fully addressed by the prior art rejections set forth below. Any new grounds of rejection set forth below have been necessitated by Applicant’s present amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 16, 21, 24, 25, 41, 47 and 56-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), and Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1).**

Regarding claims 1 and 41: Sugiyama discloses a printer (figure 1 of Sugiyama) for printing (column 6, lines 19-26 of Sugiyama) time-based media data from a media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama), the system comprising: an interface within the printer (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama) that receives the time-based media from a media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama); a multimedia processing system within the printer (figure 1(12-16,26,28-29) of Sugiyama) and coupled to the interface (as can clearly be seen in figure 1 of Sugiyama) for determining (column 3, lines 57-63 of Sugiyama) an electronic representation (figure 4 and column 4, lines 25-31 of Sugiyama) and a printed representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama); a first output device, within the printer (figure 1(18-20) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multi-media processing system to receive the electronic representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), for producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 4 and column 4, lines 30-35 of Sugiyama); and a second output device, within the printer (figure 1(31-33) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the printer representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), for producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the time-based media data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly a printing sub-system within the printer for receiving and printing standard document formats, wherein said interface is coupled to said printing sub-system; and that said multimedia processing system also issues a command that controls the media source to transmit the time-based media to the multimedia processing system, and distributes said determination between the multimedia processing system within the printer and a system external to the printer.

Ishikawa discloses a printing subsystem (figure 1(6) of Ishikawa) within a printer (figure 1(1) of Ishikawa) for receiving and printing standard document formats (column 6, lines 20-32 of Ishikawa), wherein said printing subsystem is coupled to an interface (and thus said interface is coupled to said printing subsystem) (figure 1(4) and column 7, lines 39-43 of Ishikawa); and a media processing system within said printer (figure 1(9) of Ishikawa) that distributes, between the media processing system within the printer and a system external to the printer (figure 1(1') of Ishikawa), the determination of the output representation of the input media data (column 6, lines 35-44 of Ishikawa).

Sugiyama and Ishikawa are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a subsystem for receiving and printing standard document formats, and distributing the media data processing between the printer and an external system, as taught by Ishikawa. The motivation for doing so would have been that parallel processing increases the overall speed with which media data can be processed (column 3, lines 40-48 of Ishikawa). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishikawa with Sugiyama.

The combination of Sugiyama and Ishikawa does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system also issues a command that controls the media source to transmit the time-based media data to the multimedia processing system.

Yoshimura discloses a multimedia processing system that issues a command that controls the media source to transmit the time-based media data back to the multimedia processing system (figure 1;

figure 3; and column 6, lines 39-51 of Yoshimura - *a client apparatus [figure 1(I) of Yoshimura] transmits a command which is relayed by the camera server to the appropriate camera; the camera correspondingly captures the time-based media and transmits the time-based media back to the requesting client [column 6, lines 39-51 of Yoshimura].*

The combination of Sugiyama and Ishikawa is combinable with Yoshimura because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the media processing system control the external media source *via* sending commands to the external media source to perform various functions, such as transmission of the time-based media data back to the client multimedia processing device, as taught by Yoshimura. By combination, the output device would be the printer taught by Sugiyama. Combining the teachings of Yoshimura regarding control of the external media source with the printer taught by the combined teachings of Sugiyama and Ishikawa would have been within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because the modification merely requires that one use the central point of multimedia data processing (the multimedia processing system) to control all the relevant operations, including those of the external devices that are connected. This could be performed by known methods (e.g., via software control of peripherals). Furthermore, such a modification would not change the respective functions of the disclosed elements, and would have produced predictable results. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yoshimura with the combination of Sugiyama and Ishikawa to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 41.

Further regarding claim 41: The system of claim 1 performs the method of claim 41.

Regarding claim 16: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a video port (figure 1 ("Video Signal") and column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claims 21 and 47: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a video camcorder (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 24: Sugiyama discloses that said multi-media processing system comprises a video stream processor (figure 1(15) and column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 25: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system comprises a video key frames extractor (figure 1(12) and column 3, lines 20-29 of Sugiyama).

Further regarding claims 56 and 60: Ishikawa discloses that the system external to the printer is an external computing device (figure 1(1') and column 6, lines 40-44 of Ishikawa).

Further regarding claims 57 and 61: Ishikawa discloses that the system external to the printer is an external network service (column 6, lines 49-56 of Ishikawa – *external system not only processes, but also networks the print job data*).

Further regarding claim 58: Ishikawa discloses that the multimedia processing system is configured to communicate with the system external to the printer (column 6, lines 20-25 and lines 35-40 of Ishikawa).

Further regarding claim 59: Ishikawa discloses that the multimedia processing system is configured to control functionality in the system external to the printer (column 6, lines 20-25 and lines 35-40 of Ishikawa).

Further regarding claims 62 and 64: Yoshimura discloses that sending commands to the media source further comprises controlling the media source to transmit the time-based media to a system separate from the output device (printer *as per* the combination with Sugiyama and Ishikawa) (column 6, lines 44-51 of Yoshimura – *time-based media data first transmitted to server, which separate from output devices at client side*).

Further regarding claims 63 and 65: Yoshimura discloses that sending the commands to the media source further comprises controlling the media source to capture external data (column 5, lines 51-55 of Yoshimura).

4. Claims 4-6 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Wendelken (US-6,193,658 B1).

Regarding claim 4: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the printed output is generated on a video paper.

Wendelken discloses generating a printed output on video paper (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use video paper for the output print, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been that video paper is one of several useful means for generating a permanent record of video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claims 5 and 43: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a media recorder.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a media recorder (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a media recorder, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 43.

Regarding claims 6 and 44: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a removable storage device.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a removable storage device (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Video tapes and optical discs are clearly removable storage devices.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a removable storage device, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Further, as is well-known in the art, using a *removable* storage device allows a user to switch recording devices, thus increasing the overall amount of data that can be stored and archived. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 44.

5. Claims 7 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), Wendelken (US-6,193,658 B1), Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1), and Shieh (US-2002/0185533 A1).

Further regarding claims 7 and 45: Wendelken discloses that said removable storage device (taught by Wendelken in the arguments regarding claims 6 and 44 above) is selected from one of a video tape and an optical disc (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the optical disc can specifically be either a DVD or a CD-ROM. Thus, Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the group from which said removable storage device is selected consists of not only a video tape, but also a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a memory stick, and a computer disk.

Hymel discloses a removable storage device selected from among a video tape (as is well-known in the art, a digital camcorder uses a digital video (DV) cassette tape) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel), a DVD (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD-ROM (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a computer disk (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Wendelken is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a video cassette tape, a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, and a computer disk. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para.

2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Wendelken.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Wendelken and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape, and a computer disk, but also a flash card and a memory stick.

Shieh discloses removable storage devices including a flash card (para. 18, lines 1-5 of Shieh) and a memory stick (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Wendelken and Hymel is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card and a memory stick, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to output data to one of a plurality of different output devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Wendelken and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 45.

6. **Claims 8 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Chino (US-6,118,888).**

Regarding claim 8: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Chino discloses an ultrasonic pen capture device (figure 3(102i) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to capture input data using an ultrasonic pen capture device, as taught by Chino. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an electronic pen is simply another useful output device that provides digital data a user may wish to obtain (figure 3 and column 6, lines 66-67 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 38: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises an image detection system.

Chino discloses an image detection system (figure 1(101) and column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the image detection system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that detecting an image, in this case specific types of gazes, provides useful user input (column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Regarding claim 39: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises a face recognition system.

Chino discloses a face recognition system (figure 20(406) and column 24, lines 25-27 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media

data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the face recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine which particular user corresponds to the current user by recognition of the current user's face (column 26, lines 20-22 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 39.

Regarding claim 40: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system comprises a speech recognition system.

Chino discloses a speech recognition system (column 29, lines 45-47 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the speech recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that human speech is a useful and natural form of user input (column 1, lines 15-18 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 40.

7. **Claims 9, 11-12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Shieh (US-2002/0185533 A1).**

Regarding claim 9: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a parallel port.

Shieh discloses as part of the background an input interface that comprises a parallel port (para. 5, lines 7-8 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a parallel port for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been that parallel ports are compatible with flash card readers and the older 12 Mbit/sec computer equipment (para. 5, lines 1-9 of Shieh). Thus, using a parallel port is useful if older video and/or computer equipment is being used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claims 11-12: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface (figure 2 and para. 17, lines 12-15 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a USB interface for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an increased data transfer rate, as compared with the older types of data transfer ports (para. 5, lines 7-12 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11-12.

Regarding claim 18: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a removable storage reader.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a removable storage reader (para. 17, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a removable storage reader as part of the interface, as taught by Shieh. The suggestion for doing so would have been that flash memory is applicable to various digital products (para. 5, lines 12-14 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

8. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Stevens (US-2002/0010641 A1).**

Regarding claim 10: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a wireless communication interface.

Stevens discloses an video data interface comprising a wireless communication interface (figure 3 (110) and para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Stevens because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a wireless communication interface as said interface, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

9. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Leman (US-5,436,792).

Regarding claims 13-14: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a docking station that is built into the system.

Leman discloses a docking station (column 3, lines 31-38 of Leman) that is built into the system (column 5, lines 53-61 of Leman).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Leman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of digital data output and flow. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a docking station built into the system, as taught by Leman, as part of the interface taught by Sugiyama. The motivation for doing so would have been that a docking station provides ease of connection and disconnection with external devices and peripherals (column 2, lines 6-11 of Leman). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Leman with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-14.

10. Claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1).

Regarding claim 15: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises an optical port.

Hymel discloses an interface that comprises an optical (infrared) port (para. 10, lines 13-14 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an optical port as part of said interface. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an optical port is one of many types of useful data ports for transferring digital data (para. 10, lines 3-14 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Regarding claims 20 and 46: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said media source comprises a cellular phone.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a cellular phone (para. 10, lines 3-5 and lines 14-15 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cellular phone as the media source. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a cellular phone is one of many types of useful media data input devices that can be used (para. 10, lines 14-22 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 20 and 46.

Regarding claims 22 and 48: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the media source comprises a digital audio recorder.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a digital audio recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media

data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital audio recorder as the media source. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect another one of a variety of different types of peripheral devices, thus allowing the user to perform one more of a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 22 and 48.

11. Claims 17, 29 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Dygert (US-2002/0048224 A1).

Regarding claim 17: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a port for connecting to the media source, the port selected from a group including composite video (luminance and chrominance signals) (column 3, lines 16-20 of Sugiyama) and component video (NTSC) (column 3, lines 12-14 of Sugiyama).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only composite video and component video, but also of SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video.

Dygert discloses a port for connecting a peripheral device selected from one of SCSI (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), IDE (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), RJ11 (para. 27, lines 6-9 of Dygert) and S-video (para. 50, lines 9-15 of Dygert).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to be able to further select between SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video ports. The suggestion for doing so would have

been that said ports are among some of the many available types of ports for transferring time-based media data (para. 27, lines 3-9 and para. 50, lines 1-6 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claim 29: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system is configured to communicate with the media source.

Dygert discloses a multimedia processing system (figure 1(10) of Dygert) that communicates with a media source (figure 1(13); and para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert), thus controlling the functionality of said media source (para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the multimedia processing system communicatively interact with the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Regarding claim 33: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a database server.

Dygert discloses an interface (figure 1(28) of Dygert) comprising a database server (figure 1(13) and para. 27, lines 9-16 of Dygert).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media

data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a database server as part of said interface, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

Further regarding claim 34: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a music catalog (figure 5 and para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

Further regarding claim 35: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a video database (para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

12. **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), Shieh (US-2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1), and Gerber (US-5,568,406).**

Further regarding claim 19: Shieh discloses that the removable storage reader comprises a media reader selected from a group, wherein two of said group is a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh) and a memory stick reader (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only a flash card reader, and a memory stick reader, but also a DVD reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader.

Hymel discloses a removable storage reader selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), and a computer disk reader (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, but also of an SD reader.

Gerber discloses storing digital data on an SD disk (column 10, lines 28-34 of Gerber).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Gerber because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection an SD disk. The motivation for doing so would have been that an SD disk is useful for backing up large amounts of digital data (column 10, lines 23-34 of Gerber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerber with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

13. Claims 23 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), Shieh (US-2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1), and Heilweil (US-4,881,135).

Regarding claims 23 and 49: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a media input selected from a group of a video cassette tape reader (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama), and a video capture device (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader and a video capture device, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Shieh discloses inputting digital media using a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and storage of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card reader, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to input data to one of a plurality of different input devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, and a flash card reader, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Hymel discloses a media input device selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio

Art Unit: 2625

cassette tape reader (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a digital video recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, and a digital video recorder, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Shieh.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, a flash card reader, and a digital video recorder, but also of a meeting recorder.

Heilweil discloses media input using a meeting recorder (figure 2 and column 3, lines 48-51 of Heilweil).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Heilweil because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection the meeting recorder taught by Heilweil. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide audio-visual data regarding a conference or a meeting in a concealed or discreet manner (column 2, lines 33-40 of Heilweil). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Heilweil

with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura, Shich and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23 and 49.

14. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Ohnishi (US-4,807,186).

Regarding claim 26: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system generates digital printed data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama) corresponding to a video segment in the video stream (column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said digital printed data is specifically a bar code.

Ohnishi discloses printing digital data as a bar code (column 2, lines 56-60 of Ohnishi).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Ohnishi because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a video segment in the video stream, as taught by Sugiyama, as a bar code, as taught by Ohnishi. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a bar code is one of the convenient means by which digital data is stored and later read (column 2, lines 56-62 of Ohnishi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohnishi with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

15. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Huberman (US-6,115,718).

Regarding claim 27: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to generate a web page representation of the multi-media.

Huberman discloses generating a web page representation of multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman). For a web page to exist with multi-media data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman), it is inherent that said web page is generated. Otherwise, said web page would not exist.

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a web page representation of the multi-media, as taught by Huberman. The suggestion for doing so would have been that storing data on the world wide web allows a company, educational institution, or other entity to publicly store and allow others to access digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

16. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Schroat (US-2002/0169849).

Regarding claim 31: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source.

Schroath discloses automatically detecting a communicative coupling of a media source (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Schroath because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the multi-media processing system taught by the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source, as taught by Schroath. The motivation for doing so would have been that, by using an automatic detection, digital data can be downloaded without querying the user (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath), thus providing greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Regarding claim 32: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to automatically download multi-media data from the media source.

Schroath discloses automatically downloading digital data from a media source (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Schroath because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the multi-media processing system taught by the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to automatically download digital data from a media source, as taught by Schroath, wherein said digital data is the multi-media data taught by the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura. The motivation for doing so would have been that automatically downloading digital data without querying

the user (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath) provides greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

17. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), Dygert (US-2002/0048224 A1), and Huberman (US-6,115,718).

Regarding claim 36: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Dygert does not disclose expressly that the database server comprises a web search engine.

Huberman discloses searching with a web search engine (column 8, lines 44-49 of Huberman).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Dygert is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a web search engine as part of the database, as taught by Huberman. The motivation for doing so would have been that a web search engine can lead a user to an appropriate web page containing the data desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Yoshimura and Dygert to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

18. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Klatt (US-4,754,485).

Regarding claim 37: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises a text-to-speech system.

Klatt discloses a text to speech system (figure 1 and column 3, lines 47-52 of Klatt).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Klatt because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the text-to-speech system taught by Klatt as part of said multi-media processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide phonetic output for ASCII-based media input (column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 1 of Klatt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klatt with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

19. **Claims 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Mochimaru (US-5,432,532).**

Regarding claims 52 and 54: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the first output device for producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media comprises the first output device automatically producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media.

Mochimaru discloses an output device automatically producing a corresponding electronic output (figures 13-14 and column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 15 of Mochimaru).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Mochimaru because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the first output device produce a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media, as taught by Sugiyama, automatically, as taught by Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve overall speed and performance by determining an electronic

representation of a video image without requiring the direct input of a user, as taught by the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mochimaru with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 52 and 54.

Regarding claims 53 and 55: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the printing subsystem for receiving and printing digital document formats comprises the printing sub-system for receiving and automatically printing standard document formats.

Mochimaru discloses a printing sub-system for receiving and automatically printing documents (figures 13-14 and column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 15 of Mochimaru).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Mochimaru because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the printing subsystem for receiving and printing digital document formats, as taught by Sugiyama, receive and automatically print, as taught by Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve overall speed and performance by determining an electronic representation of a video image without requiring the direct input of a user, as taught by the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mochimaru with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claims 53 and 55.

20. Claims 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Myojo (US-2002/0137544 A1).

Regarding claim 66: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system is configured to output a status message for display on a display of the media source.

Myojo discloses a multimedia processing system which is configured to output a status message for display on a display of the media source (para. 73 and 75 of Myojo – *digital camera displays messages relating to cellular connection status, transmission request confirmations, etc.*).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Myojo because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the media source so as to output a status message from the multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow someone at the camera end to take corrective action or make adjustments if necessary, such as when there is a mechanical, electronic or communication failure at the media source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Myojo with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 66.

Regarding claim 67: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system is configured to output video for display on a display of the media source.

Myojo discloses a multimedia processing system which is configured to output video for display on a display of the media source (para. 39 and 73 of Myojo – *digital camera, which can be a video camera [para. 39 of Myojo], displays received picture/video messages*).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Myojo because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the media source so as to output a video message from the multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow someone at the camera end to take corrective action or make adjustments if necessary, such as when there is a mechanical, electronic or communication failure at the media source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Myojo with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 67.

21. **Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Ishikawa (US-5,987,226), Yoshimura (US-6,556,241 B1), and Gerszberg (US-6,020,916)**

Regarding claim 68: The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system is configured to output audio using a speaker of the media source.

Gerszberg discloses a multimedia processing system that is configured to output audio using a speaker of the media source (column 9, lines 57-67 of Gerszberg – *video phone is media source and receives audio to output over the speaker from the corporate switchboard*).

The combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura is combinable with Gerszberg because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the media source so as to output an audio message from the multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow someone at the camera end to take corrective action or make adjustments if necessary, such as when there is a mechanical, electronic or communication failure at

the media source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerszberg with the combination of Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Yoshimura to obtain the invention as specified in claim 68.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is (571)272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A Thompson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

10 January 2009